



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,409	11/30/2001	Shawn P. Delany	021756-013400US	2499

51206 7590 11/07/2005

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
8TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CINDY

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2161

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/997,409

Applicant(s)

DELANY ET AL.

Examiner

Cindy Nguyen

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-22,25-33 and 36-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-22,25-33 and 36-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This is in response to amendment filed 08/31/05.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: Applicant cancel claim 3, therefore claim 5 depended on claim 3 need to be amended. Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 2, 5-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The basis of this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of:

- (1) whether the invention is within the technological arts; and
- (2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

For a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must be within the technological arts. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena) that do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts fail to promote the "progress of science and the useful" (i.e., the physical sciences as opposed to social sciences, for example) and therefore are found to be non-statutory subject matter. For a process claims to pass muster, the recited process must somehow apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts.

In the present case, claim 1 only recites an abstract idea. The recites steps of modifying entries and the steps does not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological (as computer system) arts since all the recited steps can be performed in the mind of the user or by use of a pencil and paper. These steps only constitute an idea of how to construct and modifying entries.

Claims 2, 5-21 are depended on claim 1 above, therefore rejected as above

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-15 and 17-22, 25-33, 36-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madan et al. (US 6748374) (Madan) in view of Pinard et al. (US 5940834).

Regarding claims 1, 12 and 33, Madan discloses: A method, one or more processor and an apparatus for modifying entries in an Identity System, comprising the steps of: creating a first entry for said Identity System, said first entry includes a first set of attributes based on a first set of one or more classes (col. 14, lines 40 to col. 15, lines 2, Madan); and removing a subset of said first set of attributes from said entry after said step of creating said first entry (col. 15, lines 25-42, Madan).

In addition, Madan discloses: a communication interface (1918, fig. 19, Madan) and one or more processors (1904, fig. 19, Madan).

Wherein removing the subset of said first set of attributes comprises removing a first auxiliary class of one or more auxiliary classes associated with said subset of said first set of attributes (col. 15, lines 58-64, Madan). However, Madan didn't disclose: removing auxiliary classes that are superior to said first auxiliary class and that are not superior to any auxiliary classes that remain part of said entry. On the other hand, Pinard discloses: removing auxiliary classes that are superior to said first auxiliary class and that are not superior to any auxiliary classes that remain part of said entry (col. 5, lines 11-16 and col. 6, lines 51-67, Pinard). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the step for removing auxiliary classes that are superior to said first auxiliary class and that are not superior to any auxiliary classes that remain part of said entry in the system of Madan as taught by Pinard. The motivation being to enable the system provide the program to remove unwanted the class of items and the database table relating to that

class of items and regenerated the database so the removing class does not appear on the parent web page (or database or directory).

Regarding claims 2, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein: said first set of one or more classes includes a structural class and a first set of one or more auxiliary classes (col. 15, lines 35-42, Madan).

Regarding claim 17, 28 and 39, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 22, 33 above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein: said entry is a group object (col. 11, lines 25-52, Madan); and said step of creating includes instantiating said group object (col. 11, lines 25-52, Madan).

Regarding claims 18, 29 and 40, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 17, 22, 28, 33 and 39, above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein: said step of removing includes a step of removing one or more auxiliary classes from said entry, said one or more auxiliary classes are associated with said subset of said first set of attributes (col. 15, lines 46-47, Madan).

Regarding claims 19, 30 and 41, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 3, 18, 29 and 40, above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein said step of removing one or more auxiliary classes from said entry

includes the steps of: removing a first auxiliary class associated with said subset of said first set of attributes (col. 15, lines 46-47, Madan); and removing auxiliary classes that are superior to said first auxiliary class and that are not superior to any auxiliary classes that remain part of said entry (col. 15, lines 50 to col. 16, lines 2, Madan).

Regarding claim 5, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein: said subset of said first set of attributes includes data stored in said attributes (col. 15, lines 40-44, Madan); and said step of removing a subset of said first set of attributes includes removing said data (col. 15, lines 45 to col. 16, lines 2).

Regarding claim 8, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: further comprising the step of: adding new attributes to said entry after said step of creating (col. 14, lines 40 to col. 15, lines 2, Madan).

Regarding claim 9, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 8 above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein: said step of adding new attributes includes adding one or more auxiliary classes associated with said new attributes to said entry (col. 13, lines 15-47, Madan).

Regarding claims 25 and 36, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 8 above. It is therefore rejected as above.

Regarding claims 10, 26 and 37, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 8, 25 and 36, above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein said step of adding new attributes includes the steps of: adding one or more auxiliary classes associated with said new attributes to said entry (col. 14, lines 40 to col. 15, lines 2, Madan); and adding classes to said entry that are not already part of said entry and are superior to said one or more auxiliary classes associated with said new attributes (col. 14, lines 40 to col. 15, lines 2, Madan).

Regarding claim 12, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 7 and 10 above. It is therefore rejected as above.

Regarding claims 14, 28 and 39, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 8, 22 and 33, above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein: said entry is a group entry (col. 11, lines 25-52, Madan); and at least one of said new attributes stores a rule defining dynamic membership for said group entry (col. 11, lines 25-52, Madan).

Regarding claim 15, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 8 above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein: said entry is a group entry; and at least one of said new attributes stores a subscription policy for said group entry (col. 11, lines 25-52, Madan).



Regarding claims 20, 31 and 42, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 17, 28 and 39, above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: further comprising the step of: adding new attributes to said entry after said step of creating, said step of adding new attributes includes adding one or more auxiliary classes associated with said new attributes to said entry (col. 14, lines 40 to col. 15, lines 2, Madan).

Regarding claims 21, 32 and 43, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 17, 28 and 39, above. In addition, Madan/Pinard discloses: wherein: said group object is stored in an LDAP directory (col. 12, lines 60 to col. 13, lines 7, Madan).

Claims 6, 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madan et al. (US 6748374) (Madan) in view of Pinard et al. (US 5940834) and further in view of Desgranges et al. (US 6751797) (Desgranges).

Regarding claim 6, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. However, Madan/Pinard didn't discloses: wherein said step of removing a subset of said first set of attributes includes the steps of: identifying a set of auxiliary classes in a user interface; receiving a selection of one or more of said auxiliary classes via said user interface. On the other hand, Desgranges discloses: wherein said step of removing a subset of said first set of attributes includes

Art Unit: 2161

the steps of: identifying a set of auxiliary classes in a user interface (col. 6, lines 66 to col. 7, lines 22, Desgranges); receiving a selection of one or more of said auxiliary classes via said user interface (col. 6, lines 66 to col. 7, lines 22, Desgranges). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include wherein said step of removing a subset of said first set of attributes includes the steps of: identifying a set of auxiliary classes in a user interface and receiving a selection of one or more of said auxiliary classes via said user interface in the system of Madan/Pinard as taught by Desgranges. The motivation being to enable the system provided a method consist of transforming the entry seen by the client into an LDAP entry through the home interface in order to crate delete and modify or search in the LDAP directory.

In addition , Madan/Pinard /Desgranges discloses: removing said selected one or more of said auxiliary classes (col. 9, lines 65 to col. 10, lines 4, Madan).

Regarding claim 7, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Madan/Pinard /Desgranges discloses: wherein said step of removing a subset of said first set of attributes includes the steps of: identifying a set of attributes in a user interface (col. 6, lines 66 to col. 7, lines 22, Desgranges); receiving a selection of said subset of said first set of attributes via said user interface (col. 6, lines 66 to col. 7, lines 22, Desgranges); and removing said subset of said first set of attributes from said entry (col. 14, lines 11-37, Madan). Regarding claims 13, 27 and 38, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 8, 22 and 33 above, respectively. wherein: said steps of

creating, adding and removing are performed by an integrated identity and access system (col. 9, lines 64 to col. 10, lines 65, Desgranges); and said an integrated identity and access system is capable of evaluating said new attributes to authorize a user to access a resource (col. 7, lines 64 to col. 8, lines 15, Desgranges).

Regarding claim 16, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 6 above. It is therefore rejected as above.

#### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4025. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

  
Cindy Nguyen  
November 2, 2005

  
**FRANTZ COBY**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**